

REMARKS

Original claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 have been cancelled, claims 3 and 5 have been amended and new claim 9 has been added incorporating the limitations of both 3 and 5. New claim 9 recites the treatment comprising a triple combination of urushiol together with both the secondary immunostimulator and the anti-cancer agent. The claims have also been amended to recite a further function of the compounds used in the claimed methods, i.e., the inhibition of capillary growth. Support for the new anti-angiogenesis properties can be found on page 8 in example II.

In the office action of May 21, 2003, in spite of his rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness and his rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) as anticipated by and/or rendered obvious by the cited prior art references, the Examiner admitted that claims 4 and 6 would be allowable if re-written as independent claims incorporating the limitations of claims 3 and 5 from which they respectfully depend. To this end, independent claim 3 has been amended incorporating the limitations of claim 4 whereby the immunostimulator compound urushiol is co-administered with a secondary immunostimulator compound consisting of tumor-associated proteins and antigens. Claim 5 has also been amended whereby the immunostimulator compound urushiol is co-administered with an anti-cancer agent consisting of the anthracyclines. These newly amended claims, according to the Examiner, are distinguishable over the known prior art and should be passed on to allowance and issue.

New claim 9 has been added to recite a method for treating cancer through the co-administration of an immunostimulator compound, urushiol, a secondary immunostimulator compound selected from the group consisting of tumor-associated proteins and antigens together with an anti-cancer compound selected from the group consisting of anthracyclines. Support for this new claim can be found at page six and the originally filed claims 3 – 6. Acceptance of these amendments and their incorporation into the file wrapper history, is respectfully requested.

In view of the amended and newly added claims as well as the cancellation of the remaining original claims it is respectfully requested that the Examiners objections under 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness and under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) for anticipation and obviousness in view of the cited prior art are now moot and should be withdrawn. This is particularly the case in view of the Examiners admissions in the office action of May 21, 2003 that claims 4 and 6 were patentable if written in independent form which they have been. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn so that said application and

claims may pass on to allowance and issue. Should the Examiner have remaining questions or issues pertaining to this application he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (610) 644-2980.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 18, 2003

Craig M. Bell
Craig M. Bell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,812

Pfizer Inc
Patent Department, 150-5-49
235 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017-5755
(212) **733-8791**